

REMARKS

Rejection of the claims under 35 USC § 103:

Claims 1, 4-10, and 12-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tuschl et al. in view of Goldsborough (WO 01/94626). Applicants have amended the claims to overcome the rejection. Specifically Applicants have amended claim 1 to cite a composition comprising a transfection reagent and an RNA wherein modification of the RNA enhances interaction of the RNA with the transfection reagent. Support for the amendment can be found in the specification on page 9 line 10 to page 10 line 14 and page 12 lines 14-22. It is the Applicants opinion that neither Goldsborough or Tuschl teach modification of RNA to enhance interaction with a transfection reagent. In light of the amendment, Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

Rejection of the claims under 35 USC § 102:

Claims 1, 4, 10, and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tuschl et al. Applicants have amended that claims as describe above to obviate the rejection. It is the Applicants' opinion that while Tuschl et al. teach an RNA can be modified to make the RNA more resistant to nucleases, Tuschl et al. do not teach that an RNA can be modified to enhance its interaction with a transfection reagent. In light of the amendment, Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

The Examiner's rejections are now believed to be overcome by this response to the Office Action. In view of Applicants' amendment and arguments, it is submitted that claims 1, 4-10, 12, and 13 should be allowable.

Respectfully submitted,



Kirk Ekena, Reg. No. 56,672
Mirus Bio Corporation
505 South Rosa Road
Madison, WI 53719
608-238-4400

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as express mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this date: August 17, 2006 .


Kirk Ekena